

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 18, 1998 LB 1063

SENATOR C. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, members of the body, I think one of the things we all agree on is that everyone here thinks that the program is excellent expanding the health coverage for children and that we have the three options: we can expand Medicaid, we can do a private insurance proposal, or we can do a combination. And I think the comments about entering into this knowingly and with as much information as we can get are probably at the crux of the whole matter. You have a handout that I have passed out which says "Comparison of Children's Health Plan Benefits For Medical and Surgical Health." This was prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services, and on that you see the benchmark proposals that we have to work from. The first line has the services, and it lists the different classifications on that. The second lists those classifications as how they're covered under Medicaid, and that is the first column. The second column, also one of the benchmark plans that we are able to use with 1063, is a state employee group health insurance plan. The third is the federal employee. That is also one of the benchmark proposals we can use. And finally, one of the last ones is the HMO with the largest commercial enrollment. I asked this...for this information because I certainly think that this is something, as we make a decision like this, that we need to look into. One of the issues that has come up is about the federal funding. This goes for five years and then the formula is adjusted to go for another five years. And I think one of the questions is, are we able...are we, at this point, ready to make the determination that we will continue to fund this program? Senator Jensen brought up some interesting programs. Are we giving less kids more? Would we be able to cover children beyond the age that we have listed? What about the families? And what happens to the federal funding, as Senator Maurstad said, when the five years are up, and are we prepared as a state to continue to address that issue once the federal funding has gone away? And so, I think right now what we're arguing is, do we believe that we will address this issue without having the sunset clause in there or not? And I think that's the philosophical discussion right now. I would say, going into this we need to have the information on hand and so that's why I brought this forward. I think that whenever we are dealing with an issue that has this amount of money in it and affects as many children, it behooves us to look